DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 252 TM 027 020

AUTHOR Green, Kathy E.; And Others
TITLE Effects of Population Type on Mail Survey Response Rates and on the Efficacy of Response Enhancers.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Experiments; *Mail Surveys; *Response Rates (Questionnaires); Responses; *Sample Size; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Population

ABSTRACT

Experimental studies of response rates to mail surveys were reviewed and differences in response by population type were described. Cases were selected for review if they were experimental studies that manipulated a response enhancement factor. Results suggest significant differences in typical response rates for different populations. Higher response rates may be expected from surveys of customers and educators than from surveys of the general population. Results suggest few significant differences in effects of experimental treatment by population type, a result possibly due to limited sample sizes and thus low power for such analyses. One appendix lists the 22 studies reviewed, and the other presents treatment definitions and representations. (Contains 4 tables and 12 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 252

Effects of Population Type on Mail Survey Response Rates and on the Efficacy of Response Enhancers

Kathy E. Green, University of Denver

Judith A. Boser, University of Tennessee

Susan R. Hutchinson, University of Denver

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathy Green

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, March 1997.

TM027020

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Experimental studies of response rate to mail surveys were reviewed and differences in response by population type described. Higher response rates may be expected from surveys of customers and educators than from surveys of the general population. Results suggest few significant differences in effects of experimental treatment by population type, a result possibly due to limited sample sizes and thus low power for such analyses.

It is useful to approximate the return rate for the targeted population prior to fielding a mail survey. While survey return rates change from context to context, foreknowledge of a typical return rate would allow us to plan our methodology with more confidence. As part of our method involves considering ways to maximize response, it would be useful to know whether effects of treatments intended to enhance response rates differ with different target populations. The purpose of this study was to (1) provide estimates of return rates for eight distinctly defined populations and (2) assess differences in the effect sizes of nine treatments designed to enhance response rates by type of population.

A limited number of studies have reported the effects of population definition on response rate. Baumgartner and Heberlein (1984) summarize findings from their 1978 review. They found lower return rates with general populations and higher returns with employee, school, and army populations. Their results for North American general populations were supported for European populations by Eichner and Habermehl (1981). Goyder (1982) found less difference between general and employee populations, with higher rates of return for school or army populations. Eichner and Habermehl found a slightly higher return rate for an employee than for a general population. All three studies found higher response rates for military and school populations.

Miller (1991) provides a table showing the variability of response rate by occupation and city of residence for five occupational types and five northeastern United States cities. These response rates vary from 43% to 67% by occupation and from 37% to 67% by city. Miller further presents a compilation of response rates to questionnaires sent to samples from the general public, adult women, and eastern urban business leaders. Survey response rates varied from 24% to 71%. While useful, Miller's presentation was based on a small, unsystematically chosen sample of studies and seems intended to convey how variable return rates are. Dillman (1978) provides another compilation of response rates to surveys using his Total Design Method. He found response rates that varied from 50% to 94%. His work provides us useful information, and again, was based on an extensive but unsystematic sample of studies.

Effects of response-enhancing treatments have also been examined for different populations. Jobber (1986) found a precontact letter to have a negative effect with an industrial population but a positive effect with household populations. The use of personalization has been supported with household populations, while Jobber reports nonsignificant effects in two of three studies with industrial populations. Further, effects of a small incentive ($.10) were positive with five industrial populations but insignificant with two of three household populations. Yammarino, Skinner, and Childers (1991) associated response rate and design variables for samples of consumer and institutional (e.g., educational, industrial, health care) groups. Data were obtained from 184 studies in their meta-analysis. They found follow-ups had greater impact on response rates for institutional groups than consumer groups. Stamped versus metered return postage was more influential with institutional groups than consumer postage.

These findings suggest to the researcher that varying response rates may be expected when surveying different populations and that distinct approaches to enhancing returns may be beneficial when surveying different populations.

The present study compiled response rates by type of population for a systematically selected sample of studies, thus extending the work of Dillman (1978) and Miller (1991), and evaluated effects of population type on effects of treatment, thus following the work of Jobber (1986) and Yammarino et al. (1991).

Method

Cases in the current study were selected if they were experimental studies that manipulated a response enhancement factor. More complete information about survey response by population type could certainly be obtained by compiling a census of responses to all surveys reported in the literature. Such an undertaking, however, is beyond the scope of this study. Thus, cases were selected that met the following criteria: The study used a mail survey, was published or presented in the English language, was conducted in the United States, and reported use of a manipulated treatment.

Computer searches of the four CD-ROM databases described below were conducted using the search terms "mail survey*" combined with "response rate*." The ABI/Inform database contains marketing and business publications. Sociofile contains social science works, PSYCLit (now PsychInfo) represents psychology, and ERIC contains education publications and documents. Sources were also found by examining reference lists from previously published reviews. Articles were omitted if response rate could not be identified or calculated, if information describing the population was omitted, if the study was not experimental, or if the treatment could not be clearly classified. Of the approximately 400 citations identified for inclusion in this study, 222 were included in the analyses, though not all cases had complete data. The list of studies providing the data for the current work forms Appendix A.

Population type was then coded as general public, customers, professional other than education, educators, college students, military, business people/employees, trades/agriculture, and "other." The sample size was also coded. Prior analyses have used sample size as a covariate in analyses, though to little effect. Also coded were the type of journal or conference in which the paper appeared (business, education, other), whether the topic was general or targeted for the sample, whether a self-addressed stamped envelope was enclosed or not, whether a follow-up mailing was sent or not, whether the cover letter was described or not, and whether the sample was randomly selected or not. Response rates to the initial mailing were recorded for experimental and comparison conditions. An exception to this occurred for studies in which follow-up was the manipulated treatment, for which responses to the follow-up mailing was recorded. The differences among experimental and comparison conditions were then computed. While most studies had two levels of each independent variable, some used multiple treatments. Effect size was calculated as the difference in response rate between the treatment and control conditions if two levels of the treatment variable existed, or as the pairwise difference among treatment conditions for studies using more than two levels of the treatment variable. Population categories with fewer than three cases utilizing a particular treatment were excluded in analysis of treatment effects. The analysis-wise Type I error rate was set at .05. This error rate does not accomodate inflation of Type I error due to multiple tests but did allow us to discern moderate effects with samples of very small size.

To examine response rate differences between populations, response rates were aggregated by population over all studies. Studies employing more than one treatment were represented by only one overall response rate. If more

than one treatment was reported, the overall response rate reported in the publication was used. If the response rates for levels of a single treatment treatment variable were reported in a study, response rate was calculated by averaging over the levels of that treatment. To examine treatment effects, response rates were aggregated by treatment for the populations with at least three cases. There were 15 separate types of treatments represented. Treatment types, the number of cases for each treatment type, and a brief definition of the treatment type are provided in Appendix B. The significance of differences in response rates was tested using analysis of variance.

Results

The highest proportion of studies sampled the general public (29%: Table 1). Customers made up the next most frequently sampled population category. Mean response rates for the nine population types vary. Military, blue collar, and "other" were excluded in most analyses due to small sample sizes. Response rates differed significantly across the six remaining groups, $F(5, 203) = 3.44$, $p < .006$. Pairwise differences were assessed with Tukey's HSD test, with significant differences found between the general population response rate and that of educators and between the general population and students. In keeping with analyses of previous studies, the moderating effects of sample size were examined. Sample size was not significantly correlated with response rate ($r = -.11$, $p = .11$) and had no effect on results when used as a covariate.

Table 1 here

Interactions among population type and other coded variables were examined using analyses of variance. Interactions were found for population type and use of a self-addressed, stamped envelope ($p < .03$) and for population and use of a follow-up ($p < .04$). Use of a SASE produced a higher response rate for the general public, educators, students, business persons, and blue collar workers but not for the professional or military groups. Studies reporting clear use of a follow-up also reported a higher response rate for professionals, customers, and students but not for the general public, educators, or military groups. This result does not address the effects of follow-up but rather speaks to the clarity of the article in noting whether a follow-up was used.

Response rates and effect sizes by treatment variables and population type are presented in Table 2. Table 3 presents results of the analysis of differential effectiveness of response-enhancing treatments for the ten treatments that had at least two population categories with at least three cases. The remaining five treatment types and population categories were not included in this analysis due to small sample sizes. The dependent variable in these analyses was the difference in response rate between two levels of the experimental variable (e.g., enclosed incentive versus no incentive). Differences across population type were significant only for effects of follow-up and sponsorship (university versus commercial). When population type was collapsed into only two categories (general versus other), a main effect was again found for the treatment variable follow-up, with a stronger effect of follow-up (16.3%) for specified populations ("other") and a weaker effect (3.4%) for the general population, $F = 14.82$, $p < .004$. It should be noted that the sample sizes for population types were low in most analyses and that collapsing across categories in different ways may have produced

different results. For example, while the effect of population type on levels of incentive manipulations was not significant, the effects of enclosed versus promised incentives varied from 4.3% for business persons to 21.5% for professionals. This is quite a wide range.

Tables 2 and 3 here

Interactions of population type with other coded variables for each treatment variable were examined using analyses of variance. Of the numerous analyses run, one interaction significant at $p < .05$ was found. For the incentives levels of promised/enclosed versus no incentive, the effectiveness of the incentive was stronger for a targeted than general survey of a general population but weaker for a targeted rather than general survey of other populations, $F(1,69) = 4.23$, $p < .05$. Table 4 provides te mean effects for population type by survey type.

Table 4 here

Discussion

Response Rate Comparisons Between Populations. Results suggest significant differences in typical response rates for different populations. In particular, response rates in mail surveys of customers, educators, and students were significantly (as much as one third) higher than those obtained in surveys of the general public after only one mailing. This finding is consistent with that of Baumgartner and Heberlein (1984) in that the surveys of the general population had lower response rates than students, employees, and military personnel. Differences in response rate by these population types may be explained partly by different typical educational levels for these groups. There is strong support for effects of education on response rate (Green, 1995), and professional, educational, and student groups have average educational levels higher than that of the general population.

Sudman and Bradburn (1984), commenting on high response rates from members of professional groups, surmised that two of the factors facilitating high response rates to mail surveys were the high educational level of the individuals and their familiarity with forms and questionnaires, and the relevance of the questionnaires which usually related to topics associated with their professional activities and interests. It is likely that surveys directed to specific target populations were of more relevance to those populations than were surveys sent to the general public. Questionnaires are generally sent to individuals who can provide the answers to the questions being sought. Surveys sent to the general public invite comments from all sections of the population and may lack salience to many of them. This cannot be determined absolutely without examining the topics of the individual surveys, and even then determination of salience or relevance is subjective.

Differential Effect of Response Enhancers. Dillman (1991) has commented that different survey procedures may be needed in different situations. While many aspects of the survey are up to the discretion of the researcher, the population generally comes under the heading of fixed variables that are implicit in the particular undertaking (Bruvold & Comer, 1988). If the population is specified, it then becomes beneficial to know what procedures may be most effective with that population. Results of this study do not suggest that members of different population types respond differently to many

of the various survey manipulations that were studied. This result contrasts with those of Jobber (1986) and partially contrasts with those of Yammarino et al. (1991). There were, however, differences in coding of population types and the variables examined between those studies and the present study. Yammarino initially coded samples into the following categories: consumers, educational, industrial, health care, government, and other institutional but collapsed them into two groups, consumer and institutional, for statistical purposes in the meta-analysis. Jobber, on the other hand, was interested primarily in comparing industrial with nonindustrial populations. The surveys cited in his tables represent an assortment of industrial populations, including business persons, business executives, technical personnel, employees, salespeople, road transport operators, industrial safety engineers, industrial accountants, and so forth.

Yammarino's only significant effect across populations was for follow-ups/repeated contacts. We found a significant effect across populations for follow-ups. They did also detect a nonsignificant but noticeable effect for stamped versus metered return postage. Jobber conducted no statistical analysis on the information contained in his tables (reporting on "industrial" population surveys) or between the studies he cited and non-industrial surveys.

While effects of most treatments were not statistically significant, differences due to treatment in the present study have been shown to vary according to the target population. It must be noted that in many cases the number of surveys providing data is very small. However, there is some consistency across populations for variables such as anonymity, with a total of 15 surveys surveys being represented. Treatment effects ranged from -4% to +4%. No matter what population was being surveyed, the effect was on average no more than 4%. Similar situations occurred when comparing the use of mailing labels versus individually addressed envelopes, colored questionnaires, and status of the sender. Although significant population effects were found only for follow-up and sponsor, noticeable, and in some cases more dramatic, differences between populations were evident for appeal, incentives, personalization of postage, postage class, and precontact.

It must be noted that this paper does not provide an exhaustive review of all surveys done with particular populations, but rather includes only those providing empirical evidence of the effect of specific treatments. While the design factor was a constant, surveys within any one group still differed from each other in numerous ways.

A major limitation of this study is the small number of surveys investigating a particular treatment variable within a specific population. A strength, however, is the limited inclusion of those studies that were experimental in nature and could isolate the effects of the treatment variables within each study. Continued efforts will identify a larger body of studies to contribute to this initial effort, allowing investigation of more of the variables across populations and providing greater stability of the findings. A contribution of this study is that it provides an opportunity to compare response rates of more specific groups than has been possible in previous reviews.

References

Baumgartner, R. M., & Heberlein, T. A. (1984). Research on mailed questionnaire response rates. In Lockhart, D. C. (Ed.), Making effective use of mailed questionnaires, pp. 63-75.

Boser, J. A. (1996, April). Reviewing the research on mail survey response rates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Bruvold, N. T., & Comer, J. M. (1988). A model for estimating the response rate to a mailed survey. Journal of Business Research, 16(2), 101-116.

Dillman, D. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. NY: Wiley-Interscience.

Dillman, D. (1991). The design and administration of mail surveys. Annual Review of Sociology, 17, 225-249.

Eichner, K., & Habermehl, W. (1978). Predicting response rates to mailed questionnaires (comment on Heberlein and Baumgartner, ASR, August 1978). American Sociological Review, 46, 361-363.

Goyder, J. C. (1982). Further evidence on factors affecting response rates to mailed questionnaires. American Sociological Review, 47, 550-553.

Green, K. (1995). Sociodemographic factors and mail survey response. Psychology and Marketing,13, 171-184.

Jobber, D. (1986). Improving response rates in industrial mail surveys. Industrial Marketing Management, 15, 183-195.

Miller, D. C. (1991). Handbook of research design and social measurement (5th Ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sudman, S., & Bradburn, N. (1984). Improving mailed questionnaire design. In D. C. Lockhart (Ed.), Making Effective Use of Mailed Questionnaires, New Directions for Program Evaluation, No. 21. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yammarino, F. J., Skinner, S. J., & Childers, T. L. (1991). Understanding mail survey response behavior. Public Opinion Quarterly, 55, 613-639.

Table 1. Proportion of Sample and Response Rate by Population Type

Population Type	% of Sample	Response Rate Mean	SD	Min	Max
General Public	29.0	35.3	13.4	7.5	67.1
Business	8.6	40.7	24.4	3.5	72.5
Customers	16.7	44.2	16.7	10.6	90.2
Blue collar/skilled, agriculture	3.2	30.1	14.9	16.5	55.5
Professionals	15.4	41.0	17.5	3.9	80.5
Educators	9.5	48.2	18.5	19.5	82.8
Students	13.6	48.0	17.2	18.5	85.2
Military	1.8	40.3	9.7	27.5	51.0
Other	2.3	41.1	11.5	33.3	59.5

Table 2.
Response Rate and Effect Size by Experimental Treatment and Population Type

Treatment	1[a]	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Anonymity									
Mean Response Rate	43.6	52.6	44.5		50.0	62.7	65.0	41.5	
Standard Deviation		29.3	14.3		0.0	21.9	0.0	0.0	
Mean Effect Size	1.0	2.6	-1.8		-4.0	-2.4	4.0	-4.0	
N of Studies	2	3	4	0	1	3	1	1	0
Appeal									
Mean Response Rate	48.1	55.5	29.1		33.1	38.3	65.5		
Standard Deviation	9.9	19.1	5.1		3.3	7.2	0.0		
Mean Effect Size: A[b]	-7.7	-.9	-1.0		.3	-3.3	3.0		
B	1.8	-10.5	1.9		5.5	-5.5			
C	-7.9	1.4	3.0		-4.7	0.0			
N of Studies	5	2	2	0	5	3	1	0	0
Color									
Mean Response Rate		19.7		19.6	33.7		50.4		
Standard Deviation		7.5		0.0	9.6		.5		
Mean Effect Size		3.9		-1.2	-1.9		3.0		
N of Studies	0	2	0	1	2	0	2	0	0
Deadline									
Mean Response Rate	21.8	18.8			38.4		49.1		
Standard Deviation	0.0	0.0			6.2		0.0		
Mean Effect Size	7.6	3.2			-.4		-1.5		
N of Studies	1	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	0
Follow-up									
Mean Response Rate	29.2	62.7	56.2	17.9	48.0	33.9	47.1		
Standard Deviation	15.9	0.0	15.5	0.0	12.3	0.0	17.7		
Mean Effect Size	3.4	27.3	12.1	10.6	13.0	15.2	21.0		
N of Studies	6	1	4	1	3	1	3	0	0
Incentives									
Mean Response Rate	33.8	35.8	42.7	31.2	40.9	53.0	49.6		
Standard Deviation	12.7	24.0	15.9	13.2	20.6	8.7	10.5		
Mean Effect Size: D	17.8	4.3	16.7	8.1	21.5	14.4	9.7		
E	17.8	11.0	14.3	13.3	17.2	13.5	16.3		
F	3.4	.1	4.7	3.6	1.7	3.8	3.9		
N of Studies	23	7	13	3	18	2	9	0	0
Length of Survey									
Mean Response Rate	36.4	58.9	50.2			57.9	48.6		
Standard Deviation	9.8	0.0	24.3			17.8	13.9		
Mean Effect Size	-5.2	5.9	-2.8			-2.4	-8.3		
N of Studies	7	1	2	0	0	6	4	0	0

table continues

Table 2 (continued)

Treatment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Personalization-- Labels									
Mean Response Rate	30.5		59.4			24.5	45.2		
Standard Deviation	4.7		0.0			7.1	25.3		
Mean Effect Size	2.2		-3.8			-4.0	3.4		
Personalization-- Survey									
Mean Response Rate	34.5	27.7	39.4	41.2	42.4	44.0	48.9	39.7	
Standard Deviation	16.2	3.7	9.3	20.2	17.8	19.8	23.4	0.0	
Mean Effect Size	5.5	3.9	1.1	-2.7	5.3	2.0	7.9	9.3	
N of Studies	12	2	10	2	7	8	6	1	
Personalization-- Postage									
Mean Response Rate	29.4	53.3	40.9	26.8	41.5	58.2	30.9		
Standard Deviation	9.7	27.2	16.1	10.5	11.1	0.0	16.7		
Mean Effect Size	4.6	19.2	3.6	6.6	6.0	-2.4	2.8		
N of Studies	12	2	4	2	5	1	3	0	1
Postage Class									
Mean Response Rate	25.0		35.5	28.1	40.8		38.1	48.8	
Standard Deviation	7.1		1.7	16.3	18.5		14.3	0.0	
Mean Effect Size	19.0		5.8	-1.6	17.7		12.4	24.5	
N of Studies	2	0	2	2	3	0	4	1	0
Precontact									
Mean Response Rate	35.7	47.7	50.7		39.6		44.4	39.3	59.5
Standard Deviation	12.2	25.9	26.0		18.3		17.7	16.6	0.0
Mean Effect Size	12.5	3.8	11.2		11.2		14.1	6.5	-11.0
N of Studies	15	5	7	0	2	0	4	2	1
Sponsor									
Mean Response Rate	35.8	27.8	43.4		29.5				
Standard Deviation	7.6	21.3	18.3		0.0				
Mean Effect Size: G	14.5	12.4	6.3		10.0				
H	3.0	11.5	14.3						
I	8.3	12.0	10.1		7.9				
N of Studies	3	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0

table continues

Table 2 (continued)

Treatment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Status of Sender									
Mean Response Rate		33.0	33.7		55.0	58.6			
Standard Deviation		0.0	4.3		27.6	14.3			
Mean Effect Size		1.0	-1.4		0.1	1.4			
N of Studies	0	1	2	0	2	2	0	0	0

[a]Population Types are: 1--general public, 2--business, 3--customers or alumni, 4--blue collar/skilled, agriculture, 5--professionals (not educators), 6--educators (teachers, professors), 7=students, 8=military, 9=other.

[b]Effects are: A--social-sponsor, B--social-egoistic, C--sponsor-egoistic, D--enclosed-promised, E--enclosed-no incentive, F--promised-no incentive, G--university-commercial, H--university-research, I--university-nonuniversity.

Table 3. Analysis of Variance of Treatment Effects by Population Type

Treatment	Effect for Population Type 1[a]	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	F	df	p
Anonymity--Mean		6.3	-1.8			-2.4			2.08	2,7	.20
SD		9.1	4.0			4.2					
n		3	4			3					
Appeal--A[b] Mean	-7.7				.3	-3.3			.64	2,5	.56
SD	13.9				4.0	3.4					
n	2				3	3					
B--Mean	1.8				5.5	-5.5			1.02	2,2	.49
SD	0.0				7.8	7.8					
n	1				2	2					
C--Mean	-7.9				-4.7	0.0			1.14	2,4	.40
SD	6.9				0.0	1.4					
n	4				1	2					
Follow-up--Mean	3.4	18.00							19.58	1,4	.02
SD	4.1	2.8									
n	4	2									
Incentives											
D--Mean	17.8	4.3	15.9	8.1	21.5		15.9		.94	5,15	.40
SD	15.6	1.6	1.5	4.7	8.0		1.5				
n	8	2	3	2	5		3				
E--Mean	17.8	11.0	14.1	13.3	17.2		16.3		.62	5,53	.69
SD	11.5	9.6	5.5	3.5	7.8		14.6				
n	19	6	10	3	15		6				
F--Mean	3.4	.1	4.6	3.6	1.7		3.9		.46	5,29	.80
SD	6.7	1.3	4.6	1.8	4.1		3.7				
n	12	3	8	2	6		4				
Length --Mean	-5.2					-2.4	-8.3		.41	2,14	.67
SD	9.4					11.9	7.8				
n	7					6	4				
Personalization Survey --Mean	5.5		1.1		5.3	2.0	7.9		1.26	4,38	.30
SD	4.3		8.6		6.2	7.3	8.8				
n	12		10		7	8	6				
Postage--Mean	4.6		3.6		6.0		2.8		.30	3,20	.83
SD	5.2		4.2		5.9		2.9				
n	12		4		5		3				

(table continues)

Table 3 (continued)

Treatment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	F	df	p
Postage Class											
--Mean					17.7		12.4		.51	1,5	.51
SD					5.9		11.5				
n					3		4				
Precontact-Mean	12.5	3.8	11.2				14.1		1.02	3,27	.40
SD	9.9	1.4	11.8				15.7				
n	15	5	7				4				
Sponsor G--Mean	14.5		6.3						29.43	1,2	.04
SD	2.1		.4								
n	2		2								
H--Mean	3.0		14.3						5.27	1,2	.15
SD	1.6		6.8								
n	2		2								
I--Mean	8.3		10.1						.15	1,5	.71
SD	5.7		6.0								
n	3		4								

Note. Numbers of studies vary from Table 2 due to lack of relevant information in all reports.
[a]Population Types are: 1--general public, 2--business, 3--customers or alumni, 4--blue collar/skilled, agriculture, 5--professionals (not educators), 6--educators (teachers, professors), 7=students, 8=military.
[b]Effects are: A--social-sponsor, B--social-egoistic, C--sponsor-egoistic, D--enclosed-promised, E--enclosed-no incentive, F--promised-no incentive, G--university-commercial, H--university-research, I--university-nonuniversity.

Table 4. Interactive Effect of Population Type and Topic Type on Difference in Response Rates for Promised/Enclosed versus No Incentive Treatment

	General Survey			Targeted Survey		
	Mean	SD	n	Mean	SD	n
General Population	11.3	8.8	20	20.1	11.8	3
"Other" Population	12.7	7.3	20	9.7	8.5	30

Note. Population types were collapsed into general versus all other types combined.

APPENDIX A

References for Studies in the Database

Adams, L. LaMar, & Gale, Darwin. (1982). Solving the quandary between questionnaire length and response rate in educational research. Research in Higher Education, 17(3), 231-240.

Albaum, Gerald. (1987, Fall). Do source and anonymity affect mail survey results? Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 15, 74-81.

Anderson, John F., & Berdie, Douglas R. (1975). Effects on response rates of formal and informal questionnaire follow-up techniques. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(2), 255-257.

Anderson, John F., Niebuhr, Marsha A., & Gum, Greg S. (1987, April). The effectiveness of express mail as a response stimulator in mail surveys of difficult populations. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 878)

Andreasen, Alan R. (1970). Personalizing mail questionnaire correspondence. Public Opinion Quarterly, 34, 273-277.

Armstrong, J. Scott, & Yokum, J. Thomas. (1994, April). Effectiveness of monetary incentives. Industrial Marketing Management, 23(2), 133-136.

Balakrishnan, P. V., Chawla, Sudhir K., Smith, Mary F., & Michalski, Brian Paul. (1992, Summer). Mail survey response rates using a lottery prize giveaway incentive. Journal of Direct Marketing, 6(3), 54-59.

Berdie, Douglas R. (1973). Questionnaire length and response rate. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58(2), 278-280.

Berry, Sandra H., & Kanouse, David E. (1985). Physician response to a mailed survey: An experiment in timing of payment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, 102-114.

Biner, Paul M. (1988). Effects of cover letter appeal and monetary incentives on survey response: A reactance theory application. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 9(2), 99-106.

Biner, Paul M., & Barton, Deborah L. (1990, Fall). Justifying the enclosure of monetary incentives in mail survey cover letters. Psychology and Marketing, 7(3), 153-162.

Biner, Paul M., & Kidd, Heath J. (1994). The interactive effects of monetary incentive justification and questionnaire length on mail survey response rates. Psychology and Marketing, 11(5), 483-492.

Blass, T., Leichtman, S. R., & Brown, R. A. (1981). The effect of perceived consensus and implied threat upon responses to mail surveys. Journal of Social Psychology, 113, 213-216.

Blumenfeld, Warren S. (1973). Effect of appearance of correspondence on response rate to a mail questionnaire survey. Psychological Reports, 32(1), 178.

Boser, Judith A. (1990b, April). Variations in mail survey procedures: Comparison of response rate and cost. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 803)

Brennan, Robert D. (1958, January). Trading stamps as an incentive in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing, 22, 306-307.

Brown, George H. (1975, June). Randomized inquiry vs. conventional questionnaire method in estimating drug usage rates through mail surveys. Report No. HumRRO-TR-75-14, Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Arlington, VA, ERIC ED 112 326.

Carpenter, Edwin H. (1974). Personalizing mail surveys: A replication and reassessment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 38, 614-620.

Champion, Dean J., & Sear, Alan M. (1969). Questionnaire response rate: A methodological analysis. Social Forces, 47, 335-339.

Chawla, Sudhir K., Balakrishnan, P. V., & Smith, Mary F. (1992). Mail response rates from distributors. Industrial Marketing Management, 21(4), 307-310.

Chawla, Sudhir K., & Nataraajan, Rajan. (1994). Does the name of the sender affect industrial mail response? Industrial Marketing Management, 23, 111-115.

Childers, Terry L., & Ferrell, O. C. (1979). Response rates and perceived questionnaire length in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 16, 429-431.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Childers, Terry L., Pride, William M., & Ferrell, O. C. (1980). A reassessment of the effects of appeals on response to mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 17, 365-370.

Childers, Terry L., & Skinner, Steven J. (1979). Gaining respondent cooperation in mail surveys through prior commitment. Public Opinion Quarterly, 43, 558-561.

Childers, Terry L., & Skinner, Steven J. (1985). Theoretical and empirical issues in the identification of survey respondents. Journal of the Market Research Society, 27(1), 39-53.

Clark, Gary L., & Kaminski, Peter F. (1988, Winter). How to get more for your money in mail surveys. Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing, 3(1), 17-23.

Clausen, John A., & Ford, Robert N. (1947). Controlling bias in mail questionnaires. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 42, 497-511.

Cook, James R., Schoeps, Nancy, and Kim, Sehwan. (1985). Program responses to mail surveys as a function of monetary incentives. Psychological Reports, 57, 366.

Cookingham, Frank G. (1985, April). Effect of mailing address style on survey response rate. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 015)

Corcoran, Kevin J. (1985, Spring). Enhancing the response rate in survey research. Social Work Research and Abstracts, 21(1), 2.

Cox, Eli P., III, Anderson, W. Thomas, Jr., & Fulcher, David G. (1974). Reappraising mail survey response rates. Journal of Marketing Research, 11, 413-417.

Denton, Jon J., & Tsai, Chiou Yueh. (1991, Summer). Two investigations into the influence of incentives and subject characteristics on mail survey responses in teacher education. Journal of Experimental Education, 59(4), 352-366.

Dillman, Don A. (1972). Increasing mail questionnaire response in large samples of the general public. Public Opinion Quarterly 36, 254-257.

Dillman, Don A., & Frey, James H. (1974). Contribution of personalization to mail questionnaire response as an element of a previously tested method. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(3), 297-301.

Dommeyer, Curt J. (1985). Does response to an offer of mail survey results interact with questionnaire interest? Journal of the Market Research Society, 27(1), 27-38.

Dommeyer, Curt J. (1988). How form of the monetary incentive affects mail survey response. Journal of the Market Research Society, 30(3), 379-385.

Dommeyer, Curt J. (1989). Offering mail survey results in a lift letter. Journal of the Market Research Society, 31(3), 399-408.

Duhan, Dale F., & Wilson, R. Dale. (1990). Prenotification and industrial survey responses. Industrial Marketing Management, 19(2), 95-105.

Echternacht, Gary J., & McCaffrey, Patty J. (1973). The use of certified mail in mail surveys. Research memorandum No. 73-25. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 097 339)

Elkind, Melissa, Tryon, Georgiana S., & deVito, Anthony J. (1986). Effects of type of postage and covering envelope on response rates in a mail survey. Psychological Reports, 59(1), 279-283.

Erdos, Paul L., & Regier, James. (1977). Visible vs. disguised keying on questionnaires Journal of Advertising Research, 17(1), 13-18.

Etzel, Michael J., & Walker, Bruce J. (1974). Effects of alternative follow-up procedures on mail survey response rates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(2), 219-221.

Fantasia, Saverjo C., Henig, Sherry, Gochman Eva R. G., Adams, Nancy G., & Jackson, Shirly J. (1977). Effects of personalized sponsorship of an additional covering letter on return rate and nature of evaluative response. Psychological Reports, 41, 151-154.

Faria, A. J., & Dickinson, John R. (1992). Mail survey response, speed, and cost. Industrial Marketing Management, 21(1), 51-60.

Faria, A. J., Dickinson, John R., & Filipic, Timothy V. (1990). The effect of telephone versus letter prenotification on mail survey response rate, speed, quality and cost. Journal of the Market Research Society, 32(4), 551-568.

Feild, Hubert S., Holley, William H., & Armenakis, Achilles A. (1978). Computerized answer sheets: What effects on response to a mail survey? Educational and Psychological Measurement,????? 755-759.

Fields, D. Michael, & Paksoy, Christie H. (1991). Geographical differences in personalized mail survey response. Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business, 27(2), 153-166.

Finlay, Jim, & Thistlethwaite, Paul C. (1992). Applying mail response enhancement techniques to health care surveys: A cost-benefit approach. Health Marketing Quarterly, 10(1,2), 91-102.

Finn, David W. (1983, Winter). Response speeds, functions, and predictability in mail surveys. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 11(2), 61-70.

Ford, Neil M. (1967, May). The advance letter in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 4, 202-204.

Frazier, George, & Bird, Kermit. (1958, October). Increasing the response of a mail questionnaire. Journal of Marketing, 23, 186-187.

Frey, James H. (1991). The impact of cover design and first questions on response rates for a mail survey of skydivers. Leisure Sciences, 13(1), 67-76.

Friedman, Hershey H., & San Augustine, Andre J. (1979). The effects of a monetary incentive and the ethnicity of the sponsor's signature on the rate and quality of response to a mail survey. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 7(2), 95-101.

Fuller, Carol. (1974). Effect of anonymity on return rate and response bias in a mail survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(3), 292-296.

Furse, David H., & Stewart, David W. (1982). Monetary incentives versus promised contribution to charity: New evidence on mail survey response. Journal of Marketing Research, 19, 375-380.

Furse, David H., Stewart, David W., & Rados, David L. (1981). Effects of foot-in-the-door, cash incentives, and followups on survey response. Journal of Marketing Research, 18, 473-478.

Futrell, Charles M., & Hise, Richard T. (1982, October). The effects of anonymity and a same-day deadline on the response rate to mail surveys. European Research, 10, 171-175.

Futrell, Charles M., & Lamb, Charles W., Jr. (1981). Effect on mail survey return rates of including questionnaires with follow-up letters. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 52, 11-15.

Futrell, Charles M., & Swan, John E. (1977). Anonymity and response by salespeople to a mail questionnaire. Journal of Marketing Research, 14, 611-616.

Gillpatrick, Thomas R., Harmon, Robert R., & Tseng, L. P. Douglas. (1994). The effect of a nominal monetary gift and different contacting approaches on mail survey response among engineers. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 41(3), 285-289.

Gitelson, Richard J., & Drogin, Ellen B. (1992). An experiment on the efficacy of a certified final mailing. Journal of Leisure Research, 24(1), 72-78.

Gitelson, Richard, Kerstetter, Deborah, & Guadagnolo, Frank. (1993). Research note: The impact of incentives and three forms of postage on mail survey response rates. Leisure Sciences, 15, 321-327.

Glisan, George, & Grimm, Jim L. (1982). Improving response rate in an industrial setting: Will traditional variables work? Southern Marketing Association Proceedings, 20, 265-268.

Green, Kathy E., Jacobi, M. Donna, Lam, Tony C. M., Boser, Judith A., & Hall, Carroll L. (1993, April). The effects of two types of appeal on survey response rates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.

Green, Kathy E., & Kvidahl, Robert F. (1989). Personalization and offers of results: Effects on response rates. Journal of Experimental Education, 57(3), 263-269.

Green, Kathy E., & Stager, Susan F. (1986). The effects of personalization, sex, locale, and level taught on educators' responses to a mail survey. Journal of Experimental Education, 54(4), 203-206.

Greer, Thomas V., & Lohtia, Ritu. (1994). Effects of source and paper color on response rates in mail surveys. Industrial Marketing Management, 23(1), 47-54.

Gullahorn, Jeanne E., & Gullahorn, John T. (1963). An investigation of the effects of three factors on response to mail questionnaires. Public Opinion Quarterly, 27(2), 294-296.

Gullahorn, John T., & Gullahorn, Jeanne F. (1959). Increasing returns from nonrespondents. Public Opinion Quarterly, 23, 119-121.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Hancock, John W. (1940). An experimental study of four methods of measuring unit costs of obtaining attitude toward the retail store. Journal of Applied Psychology, 24, 213-230.

Hansen, Robert A. (1980). A self-perception interpretation of the effect of monetary and nonmonetary incentives on mail survey respondent behavior. Journal of Marketing Research, 17, 77-83.

Hansen, Robert A., & Robinson, Larry M. (1980). Testing the effectiveness of alternative foot-in-the-door manipulations. Journal of Marketing Research, 17, 359-364.

Harris, James R., & Guffey, Hugh J., Jr. (1978). Questionnaire returns: Stamps versus business reply envelopes revisited. Journal of Marketing Research, 15, 290-293.

Hawes, Jon M., Crittenden, Vicky L., & Crittenden, William F. (1987, September). The effects of personalization, source and offer on mail survey response rate and speed. Akron Business & Economic Review, 18(2), 54-63.

Hawkins, Del I. (1979). The impact of sponsor identification and direct disclosure of respondent rights on the quantity and quality of mail survey data. Journal of Business, 52(4), 577-590.

Heaton, Eugene E., Jr. (1965). Increasing mail questionnaire returns with a preliminary letter. Journal of Advertising Research, 5(4), 36-39.

Henley, James R., Jr. (1976). Response rate to mail questionnaires with a return deadline. Public Opinion Quarterly, 40(3), 374-375.

Hendrick, Clyde, Borden, Richard, Giesen, Martin, Murray, Edward J., & Seyfried, B. A. (1972). Effectiveness of ingratiation tactics in a cover letter on mail questionnaire response. Psychonomic Science, 26(6), 349-351.

Hensley, Wayne E. (1974). Increasing response rate by choice of postage stamps. Public Opinion Quarterly, 38, 280-283.

Hesseldenz, Jon S., & Smith, Barbara G. (1977). Computer-prepared questionnaires and grouping theories: Considerations for mail surveys in academic settings. Research in Higher Education, 6(1), 85-94.

Hewett, W. C. (1974). How different combinations of postage on outgoing and return envelopes affect questionnaire returns. Journal of the Market Research Society, 16, 49-50.

Hinrichs, J. R. (1975). Effects of sampling, follow-up letters, and commitment to participation on mail attitude survey response. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(2), 249-251.

Hopkins, Kenneth D., Hopkins, B. R., & Schon, Isabel. (1988). Mail surveys of professional populations: The effects of monetary gratuities on return rates. Journal of Experimental Education, 56(4), 173-175.

Hopkins, Kenneth D., & Podolak, James. (1983). Class-of-mail and the effects of monetary gratuity on the response rates of mailed questionnaires. Journal of Experimental Education, 51, 169-170.

Hoppe, Donald J. (1952). Certain factors found to improve mail survey returns. Proceedings of the Iowa Academy of Science, 59, 374-376.

Hornik, Jacob. (1981). Time cue and time perception effect on response to mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 18, 243-248.

Hornik, Jacob. (1982). Impact of pre-call request form and gender interaction on response to a mail survey. Journal of Marketing Research, 19, 144-151.

Horowitz, Joseph L., & Sedlacek, William E. (1974). Initial returns on mail questionnaires: A literature review and research note. Research in Higher Education, 2, 361-367.

House, James S., Gerber, Wayne, & McMichael, Anthony J. (1977). Increasing mail questionnaire response: A controlled replication and extension. Public Opinion Quarterly, 41, 95-99.

Houston, Michael J., & Jefferson, Robert W. (1975). The negative effects of personalization on response patterns in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 12, 114-117.

Houston, Michael J., & Nevin, John R. (1977). The effects of source and appeal on mail survey response patterns. Journal of Marketing Research, 14, 374-378.

Hubbard, Raymond, & Little, Eldon L. (1988a). Cash prizes and mail survey response rates: A threshold analysis. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 16(3-4), 42-44.

Hubbard, Raymond, & Little, Eldon L. (1988b). Promised contributions to charity and mail survey response: Replication with extension. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52(2), 223-230.

Huck, Schuyler W., & Gleason, Edwin M. (1974). Using monetary inducements to increase response rates from mailed surveys. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(2), 222-225.

Jacobs, Lucy Cheser. (1986, April). Effect of the use of optical-scan sheets on survey response rate. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 660)

James, Jeannine M., & Bolstein, Richard. (1990). The effect of monetary incentives and follow-up mailings on the response rate and response quality in mail surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly, 54(3), 346-361.

James, Jeannine M., & Bolstein, Richard. (1992). Large monetary incentives and their effect on mail survey response rates. Public Opinion Quarterly, 56(4), 442-453.

Jones, Wesley H., & Lang, James R. (1980). Sample composition bias and response bias in a mail survey: A comparison of inducement methods. Journal of Marketing Research, 17, 69-76

Jones, Wesley H., & Linda, Gerald. (1978). Multiple criteria effects in a mail survey experiment. Journal of Marketing Research, 15, 280-284.

Kamins, Michael A. (1989). The enhancement of response rates to a mail survey through a labelled probe foot-in-the-door approach. Journal of the Market Research Society, 31(2), 273-283.

Kawash, Mary B., & Aleamoni, Lawrence M. (1971). Effect of personal signature on the initial rate of return of a mailed questionnaire. Journal of Applied Psychology, 55(6), 589-592.

Kephart, William M., & Bressler, Marvin. (1958). Increasing the responses to mail questionnaires: A research study. Public Opinion Quarterly, 22, 123-132.

Kerin, Roger A. (1974). Personalization strategies, response rate and response quality in a mail survey. Social Science Quarterly, 55(1), 175-181.

Kerin, Roger A., & Harvey, Michael G. (1976). Methodological considerations in corporate mail surveys: A research note. Journal of Business Research, 4(3), 277-281.

Kernan, Jerome B. (1971). Are 'bulk-rate occupants' really unresponsive? Public Opinion Quarterly, 35, 420-422.

Kimball, Andrew E. (1961, October). Increasing the rate of return in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing, 25, 63-64.

King, Francis W. (1970). Anonymous versus identifiable questionnaires in drug usage surveys. American Psychologist, 25, 982-985.

Kish, G. B., & Barnes, Jonathan. (1973). Variables that affect return rate of mailed questionnaires. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 29, 98-100.

Klose, Allen, & Ball, A. Dwayne. (1995). Using optical mark read surveys: An analysis of response rate and quality. Journal of the Market Research Society, 37(3), 269-286.

Labrecque, David P. (1978, October). A response rate experiment using mail questionnaires. Journal of Marketing, 42, 82-83.

LaGarce, Raymond, & Kuhn, Linda D. (1995). The effect of visual stimuli on mail survey response rates. Industrial Marketing Management, 24(1), 11-18.

Lam, Julie A., Malaney, Gary D., & Oteri, Lisa A. (1990). Strategies to increase student response rates to mail surveys. Journal of Marketing for Higher Education, 3(1), 89-105.

Linsky, Arnold S. (1965). A factorial experiment in inducing responses to a mail questionnaire. Sociology and Social Research, 49, 183-189.

Little, Eldon L., & Engelbrecht, Edwin G. (1990). The use of incentives to increase mail survey response rates in a business environment: A field experiment. Journal of Direct Marketing, 4(4), 46-49.

London, Sandra J., & Dommeyer, Curt J. (1990). Increasing response to industrial mail surveys. Industrial Marketing Management, 19(3), 235-241.

Longworth, Donald S. (1953). Use of a mail questionnaire. American Sociological Review, 18, 310-313.

Lorenzi, Peter, Friedmann, Roberto, & Paolillo, Joseph G. P. (1988). Consumer mail survey responses: More (unbiased) bang for the buck. Journal of Consumer Marketing, 5(4), 31-40.

Martin, J. David, & McConnell, Jon P. (1973). Mail questionnaire response induction: The effect of four variables on the response of a random sample to a difficult questionnaire. Social Science Quarterly, 51, 409-414.

Martin, Warren S., Duncan, W. Jack, & Sawyer, Jesse C. (1984). The interactive effects of four response rate inducements in mailed questionnaires. College Student Journal, 18, 143-149.

Mason, Ward S., Dressel, Robert J., & Bain, Robert K. (1961, Summer). An experimental study of factors affecting response to a mail survey of beginning teachers. Public Opinion Quarterly, 25, 296-299.

Matteson, Michael T. (1974). Type of transmittal letter and questionnaire color as two variables influencing response rates in a mail survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59(4), 535-536.

May, Robert C. (1960, November). What approach gets the best return in mail surveys. Industrial Marketing, 45, 50-51.

McClanahan, Randy, & Valiga, Michael. (1990, April). Time-of-return effects in mail surveys. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

McCrohan, Kevin F., & Lowe, Larry S. (1981). A cost-benefit approach to postage used on mail questionnaires. Journal of Marketing, 45, 130-133.

McDaniel, Stephen W., & Jackson, Ralph W. (1984). Exploring the probabilistic incentive in mail survey research. In R. W. Belk, R. Peterson, G. S. Albaum, M. B. Holbrook, R. A. Kerin, N. K. Malhotra, and P. Wright (Eds.), 1984 AMA Educators' Proceedings (pp. 372-375). Chicago: American Marketing Association.

McDaniel, Stephen W., & Rao, C. P. (1981). An investigation of respondent anonymity's effect on mailed questionnaire response rate and quality. Journal of the Market Research Society, 23(3), 150-160.

McKee, Daryl O. (1992). The effect of using a questionnaire identification code and message about non-response follow-up plans on mail survey response characteristics. Journal of the Market Research Society, 34(2), 179-191.

Miller, Margaret M. (1994). The effects of cover letter appeal and nonmonetary incentives on university professors' response to a mail survey. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 372 093)

Mizes, J. Scott, Fleece, E. Louis, & Roos, Cindy. (1984). Incentives for increasing return rates: Magnitude levels, response bias, and format. Public Opinion Quarterly, 48, 794-800.

Moore, Clarence Carl. (1941, October). Increasing the returns from questionnaires. Journal of Educational Research, 35, 138-141.

Moss, Vanessa D., & Worthen, Blaine R. (1991). Do personalization and postage make a difference on response rates to surveys of professional populations? Psychological Reports, 68, 692-694.

Munger, Gail F., & Loyd, Brenda H. (1988). The use of multiple matrix sampling for survey research. Journal of Experimental Education, 56(4), 187-191.

Murphy, Paul R., Daley, James M., & Dalenberg, Douglas R. (1991). Exploring the effects of postcard prenotification on industrial firms' response to mail surveys. Journal of the Market Research Society, 33(4), 335-341.

Myers, James H., & Haug, Arne F. (1969). How a preliminary letter affects mail survey returns and costs. Journal of Advertising Research, 9(3), 37-39.

Nevin, John R., & Ford, Neil M. (1976). Effects of a deadline and a veiled threat on mail survey responses. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61(1), 116-118.

Newman, Sheldon W. (1962). Differences between and early and late respondents to a mailed survey. Journal of Advertising Research, 2, 37-39.

Nichols, Robert C., & Meyer, Mary Alice. (1966). Timing postcard follow-ups in mail questionnaire surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly, 30(2), 306-307.

Nitecki, Danuta A. (1978). Effects of sponsorship and nonmonetary incentive on response rate. Journalism Quarterly, 55(3), 581-583.

Ogborne, Alan C.,Rush, Brian, & Fondacaro, Rocco. (1986). Dealing with nonrespondents in a mail survey of professionals: The cost-effectiveness of two alternatives. Evaluation and the Health Professions, 9(1), 121-128.

Paolillo, Joseph G. P., & Lorenzi, Peter. (1984). Monetary incentives and mail questionnaire response rates. Journal of Advertising, 13, 46-48.

Parsons, Robert J., & Medford, Thomas S. (1972). The effect of advance notice in mail surveys of homogeneous groups. Public Opinion Quarterly, 36(2), 258-259.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Parthasarathy, Anuradha, Sailor, Perry, & Worthen, Blaine R. (1995, April). Effects of respondents' socioeconomic status and timing and amount of incentive payment on mailed questionnaire response rates. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Peterson, Robert A. (1975, July). An experimental investigation of mail survey responses. Journal of Business Research, 3, 199-210.

Peterson, Robert A., Albaum, Gerald, & Kerin, Roger A. (1989). A note on alternative contact strategies in mail surveys. Journal of the Market Research Society, 31(3), 409-418.

Phillips, William M., Jr. (1951). Weaknesses of the mail questionnaire: A methodological study. Sociology and Social Research, 35, 260-267.

Powers, Donald E., & Alderman, Donald L. (1982). Feedback as an incentive for responding to a mail questionnaire. Research in Higher Education, 17(3), 207-211.

Pressley, Milton M. (1978). Care needed when selecting response inducements in mail surveys of commercial populations. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 6(4), 336-343.

Pressley, Milton M., & Tuller, William L. (1977, February). A factor interactive investigation of mail survey response rates from a commercial population. Journal of Marketing Research, 14, 108-111.

Pucel, David J., Nelson, Howard F., & Wheeler, David N. (1971, March). Questionnaire follow-up returns as a function of incentives and respondent characteristics. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 19, 188-193.

Roberts, Robert E., McCrory, Owen F., & Forthofer, Ronald N. (1978). Further evidence on using a deadline to stimulate responses to a mail survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 42, 407-410.

Robertson, Dan H., & Bellenger, Danny N. (1978). A new method of increasing mail survey responses: Contributions to charity. Journal of Marketing Research, 15, 632-633.

Robin, Donald P., & Walters, C. Glenn. (1976). The effect on return rates of messages explaining monetary incentives in mail questionnaire studies. Journal of Business Communication, 13(3), 49-54.

Roscoe, A. Marvin, Lang, Dorothy, & Sheth, Jagdish N. (1975, April). Follow-up methods, questionnaire length, and market differences in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing, 39, 20-27.

Rucker, Margaret, Hughes, R., Thompson, R., Harrison, A., & Vanderlip, N. (1984). Personalization of mail surveys: Too much of a good thing? Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44(4), 893-905.

Rudd, Nancy M., & Maxwell, Nan L. (1980). Mail survey response rates: Effects of questionnaire topic and length and recipients' community. Psychological Reports, 46(2), 435-440.

Salomone, Paul R., & Miller, Glenn C., Jr. (1974). Strategies for increasing response rates to mailed questionnaires: An experimental study. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Studies in Vocational Choice and Career Planning.

Schewe, Charles D., & Cournoyer, Norman G. (1976). Prepaid vs. promised monetary incentives to questionnaire response: Further evidence. Public Opinion Quarterly, 40(1), 105-107.

Schneider, Kenneth C., & Johnson, James C. (1995). Stimulating response to market surveys of business professionals. Industrial Marketing Management, 24, 265-276.

Scott, Frances Gillespie. (1957). Mail questionnaires used in a study of older women. Sociology and Social Research, 41, 281-284.

Shale, Doug. (1987). The combined effect of personalized appeal and precoding of personal data on questionnaire returns. Research in Higher Education, 26(3), 299-310.

Shank, Matthew D., Darr, Brian D., & Werner, Thomas C. (1990). Increasing mail survey response rates: Investigating the perceived value of cash versus non-cash incentives. Applied Marketing Research, 30(3), 28-32.

Shuttleworth, Frank K. (1931). A study of questionnaire technique. Journal of Educational Psychology, 22, 652-658.

Simon, Raymond E. (1967). Responses to personal and form letters in mail surveys. Journal of Advertising Research, 7, 28-30.

Sirken, Monroe G., Pifer, James W., & Brown, Morton L. (1960). Survey procedures for supplementing mortality statistics. American Journal of Public Health, 50(11), 1753-1764.

Sletto, Raymond F. (1940, February). Pretesting of questionnaires. American Sociological Review, 15, 193-200.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Smith, Edward M., & Hewett, Wendell. (1972, July). The value of a preliminary letter in postal survey response. Journal of the Market Research Society, 14, 145-151.

Smith, Kerry, & Bers, Trudy. (1987). Improving alumni survey response rates: An experiment and cost-benefit analysis. Research in Higher Education, 27(3), 218-225.

Snyder, Marshall, & Lapovsky, David. (1984). Enhancing survey response from initial non-consenters. Journal of Advertising Research, 24(3), 17-20.

Spry, Vivien M., Hovell, Melbourne F., Sallis, James G., Hofstetter, C. Richard, Elder, John P., & Molgaard, Craig A. (1989). Recruiting survey respondents to mail surveys; Controlled trials of incentives and prompts. American Journal of Epidemiology, 130(1), 166-172.

Stafford, James E. (1966). Influence of preliminary contact on mail returns. Journal of Marketing Research, 3, 410-411.

Steele, Thomas J., Schwendig, W. Lee, & Reilly, Michael D. (1989). Modes of address and response rates in mail surveys. Applied Marketing Research, 29(1), 19-21.

Sutton, Robert J., & Zeits, Linda I. (1992). Multiple prior notifications, personalization, and reminder surveys: Do they have an effect on survey response rates? Marketing Research: A Magazine of Management and Appplications, 4(4), 14-21.

Swan, John E., Epley, Donald E., & Burns, William L. (1980). Can follow-up response rates to a mail survey be increased by including another copy of the questionnaire? Psychological Reports, 47(1), 103-106.

Taylor, Barbara G., & Anderson, Lane K. (1989). Mail survey incentives: The benefits of pretesting. Applied Marketing Research, 29(3), 25-28.

Tedin, Kent L., & Hofstetter, C. Richard. (1982). The effect of cost and importance factors on the return rate for single and multiple mailings. Public Opinion Quarterly, 46, 122-128.

Tollefson, Nona, Tracy, D. B., & Kaiser, Javaid. (1984, April). Improving response rates and response quality in educational survey research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 305)

Tyagi, Pradeep K. (1989). The effects of appeals, anonymity, and feedback on mail survey response patterns from salespeople. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 17(3), 235-241.

Veiga, John F. (1974, April). Getting the mail questionnaire returned: Some practical research considerations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 217-218.

Vocino, Thomas. (1977, October). Three variables in stimulating responses to mailed questionnaires. Journal of Marketing, 41, 76-77.

Waisanen, F. B. (1954, Summer). A note on the response to a mailed questionnaire. Public Opinion Quarterly, 18, 210-212.

Walker, Bruce J., & Burdick, Richard K. (1977). Advance correspondence and error in mail surveys. Journal of Marketing Research, 14(3), 379-382.

Watson, John J. (1965). Improving the response rate in mail research. Journal of Advertising Research, 5, 48-50.

Weilbacher, William M., & Walsh, H. Robert. (1952, January). Mail questionnaires and the personalized letter of transmittal. Journal of Marketing, 16, 331-336.

Welch, Joe L., & Massey, Tom K. (1987). A data collection alternative for service professionals: The 'Answer Check.' Journal of Professional Services Marketing, 3(1-2), 35-45.

Whitmore, William J. (1976). Mail survey premiums and response bias. Journal of Marketing Reseach, 13, 46-50.

Wilde, Judith Busch, Tonigan, J. Scott, & Gordon, Wayne I. (1988, April). Survey research: Why respond? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302 552

Wildman, Richard C. (1977). Effects of anonymity and social setting on survey responses. Public Opinion Quarterly, 41, 74-79.

Wiseman, Frederick. (1973). Factor interaction effects in mail survey response rates. Journal of Marketing Research, 10(3), 330-333.

Wolfe, Arthur C., & Treiman, Beatrice R. (1979). Postage types and response rates in mail surveys. Journal of Advertising Research, 19(1), 43-48.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Woodward, Joanne M., & McKelvie, Stuart J. (1985). Effects of topical interest and mode of address on response to mail survey. Psychological Reports, 57(3, Pt. 1), 929-930.

Worthen, Blaine R., & Valcarce, Rebecca W. (1985). Relative effectiveness of personalized and form covering letters in initial and follow-up mail surveys. Psychological Reports, 57, 735-744.

Wotruba, Thomas R. (1966, November). Monetary inducements and mail questionnaire response. Journal of Marketing Research, 3, 398-400.

Wynn, George W., & McDaniel, Steven W. (1985). The effect of alternative foot-in-the-door manipulations on mailed questionnaire response rate and quality. Journal of the Market Research Society, 27(1), 15-26.

Zusman, Barbara J., & Duby, Paul. (1987). An evaluation of the use of monetary incentives in postsecondary survey research. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 20(4), 73-78.

APPENDIX B

TREATMENT DEFINITIONS AND REPRESENTATION IN DATA BASE

Treatment Type	Definition	Cases
Anonymity	Survey identifiable or not.	15
Color	Survey copied on white or colored paper.	7
Cover Letter Appeal	Three levels: appeal to betterment of society (social utility appeal), benefits to survey sponsor (sponsor appeal), benefits to respondent (egoistic appeal).	18
Deadline	Due date listed in cover letter or not.	7
Follow-up	Phone, letter, or postcard follow-up or not.	20
Incentives	Three levels: enclosed incentives, promised incentives, or no incentive.	75
Personalization of Cover Letter	Cover letter/survey personalized (hand-signed, personal inside address) or not.	49
Personalization of Labels	Labels personalized (hand-typed) or not (machine generated).	10
Personalization of Postage	Postage personalized (regular, commemorative stamps) or not (business reply).	30
Length	Longer or shorter.	20
Postage Class	High class or lower class.	15
Precontact	Precontact (phone, postcard, letter) or not.	38
Salience	Relevance of survey topic of sample (more or less).	5
Sponsor	Three levels: university, research firm, commercial organizations.	7
Status	Higher or lower status of cover leter signator (e.g., professor vs. student)	